



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/727,322

12/03/2003

Victor S. Chan

CA920030029US1

6214

50170

7590

05/14/2008

IBM CORP. (WIP)

c/o WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C.

P.O. BOX 832745

RICHARDSON, TX 75083

EXAMINER

ABEDIN, SHANTO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/14/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This office action is in response to communications filed on 12/18/2007. Finality of the previous office action is withdrawn (please see response to arguments below), and subsequently this office action is made **FINAL**.
2. Claims 1- 4, 6-13, 15-22 and 24-27 have been presented for examination.
3. Claims 1- 4, 6-13, 15-22 and 24-27 have been rejected.

***Response to Arguments***

4. The applicant's arguments regarding the previous 35 USC 103(a) type rejections are fully considered, however, these arguments are moot in view of newly found ground of rejection (please see below for detail).
5. In response to the applicant's arguments that previous 35 USC 103(a) type rejections in view of commonly owned reference Hinton et al was improper, the examiner withdraws previous 35 USC 103 (a) type rejections in view of reference Hinton et al . However, the examiner notes, since Hinton et al reference is properly qualify for 35 USC 102 (e) type reference, Hinton et al is used to reject independent claims 1, 10 and 19 in this office action under 35 USC 102 (e) (please see the office action below)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that

Art Unit: 2135

the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1- 4, 6-13, 15-22 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al (US 6668322 B1) in view of Low et al ( US 6996605 B2) further in view of Martherus et al (US 7194764B2)

***Regarding claim 1 and 19,*** Wood et al discloses a method/ system for managing multiple user identities for a user of an electronic commerce (e-commerce) site, the method comprising:

defining the e-commerce site as a plurality of security domains (Col 13, lines 1-20; Col 15, starting at line 9; security architecture; controlling access to several/ multi level domains); and

in response to a user's request to invoke an operation of the e-commerce site:

determining a security domain of the plurality of security domains to which the operation relates (Fig 4.410: domainId; Col 13, lines 1-20; Col 15, starting at line 9; Col 16, starting at line 35; session credentials/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions; accessing resources in several/ multi level domains) ; and

reusing the session for the user automatically in accordance with the determined security domain, the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain; and persisting said session for reuse (Col 11, starting at line 11; Col 16, starting at line 50; session creation; Col 8, starting at line 9; Col 13, starting at line 5; Col 15, starting at line 8; Col 16, starting at line 35; Claim 1,12; session credentials/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions).

Wood et al fails to disclose selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user based on the determined security domain.

However, Low et al discloses selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user (Col 2, line 6 -42; Col 13, line 15-67; Claims 1-13; user selecting a session to join from plurality of sessions), and

Martherus et al discloses selecting a session persisted for the user based on the determined security domain ( Col 2, line 1-40; Col 8, line 40-67; Claims 1-36; need not to re-authenticate the user in second domain; persisted sessions in multiple domains ). Martherus et al further discloses the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain (Col 2, line 1-40; Col 8, line 40-67; Claims 1-36).

Martherus et al , Low et al and Wood et al are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of session management. At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Martherus et al or Low et al with Wood et al to design a method further comprising the step of selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user based on the determined security domain in order to provide user with multiple session access.

***Regarding claim 10***, it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 1, furthermore, Wood et al discloses a computer readable medium tangibly embodying computer executable code for managing multiple user identities for a user of an electronic commerce (e-commerce) site defined

using the plurality of security domains, wherein the computer executable code, when executed on a computing device, causes the computing device to:

in response to a user's request to invoke an operation of the e-commerce site (Fig 2; operations after step 201: access requests; Col 6, line 44-56; Col 15, starting at line 8; handling access requests; resource identification):

determining a security domain of the plurality of the security domains to which the operation relates (Fig 4.410: domainId; Col 13, lines 1-20; Col 15, starting at line 9; accessing resources in several/ multi level domains);

reusing the session for the user automatically in accordance with the determined security domain, the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain; and persisting said session for reuse (Col 11, starting at line 11; Col 16, starting at line 50; session creation; Col 8, starting at line 9; Col 13, starting at line 5; Col 15, starting at line 8; Col 16, starting at line 35; Claim 1,12; session credentials/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions).

Wood et al fails to disclose selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user based on the determined security domain.

However, Low et al discloses selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user (Col 2, line 6 -42; Col 13, line 15-67; Claims 1-13; user selecting a session to join from plurality of sessions), and

Martherus et al discloses selecting a session persisted for the user based on the determined security domain ( Col 2, line 1-40; Col 8, line 40-67; Claims 1-36; need not to re-authenticate the user in second domain; persisted sessions in multiple domains ). Martherus et al further discloses the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain (Col 2, line 1-40; Col 8, line 40-67; Claims 1-36).

***Regarding claim 2,*** it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 1, furthermore, Wood et al discloses the method comprising invoking the requested operation with the user identity and the role of the selected session (Col 10, starting at line 63; Col 16, starting at line 35, session objects; access requests).

Furthermore, Martherus et al discloses invoking the requested operation with the user identity and the role of the selected session (Col 2, line 1-40; Col 8, line 40-67; Claims 1-36; user authentication based on identity and roles for persisted sessions in multiple domains).

***Regarding claim 3,*** it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 2, furthermore, Wood et al discloses the method wherein the selected session comprises information indicating at least one of: the user preference's for invoking operations at the e-commerce site; the user's preferences for invoking operations at least the determined security domain (Col 12, starts at line 66; Col 15, starting at line 9; resource identification: session tokens for several domains); and a security signature for authenticating the selected session information (Col 14, starting at line 60; assigning signed/ cryptographically secured session credentials for different sessions/ domains).

Furthermore, Martherus et al discloses the user preference's for invoking operations at the e-commerce site; the user's preferences for invoking operations at least the determined security domain (Col 2, line 1- 67; Col 8, line 40-67; Claims 1-36; determining user's resource requests in multiple domains).

***Regarding claim 4***, it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 1, furthermore, Wood et al discloses the method comprising evaluating the requested operation to determine an operation type and wherein said step of performing is performed in accordance with the operation type (Col 15, starting at line 9; accessing requested resources).

***Regarding claim 6***, it is rejected applying as above rejecting claim 4, furthermore, Wood et al discloses the method wherein the user identity is associated with an identity type for permitting the invocation of operations; wherein said method comprises receiving the user's request in association with the plurality of sessions persisted for the user and retrieving a user identity for the determined security domain from said plurality of sessions; and wherein said performing is performed in response to the identity type of the retrieved user identity (Col 3, starting at line 1; Col 10, starting at line 48; Col 16, starting at line 35; Claim 1,12; session credentials/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions; Claims 1,12; session credential including user identifying information; session continuity; requests).



***Regarding claim 7, Wood et al*** discloses the method wherein said step of persisting comprises providing one or more cookies defining the session to the user for associating with a subsequent request (Col 8, starting at line 9; Col 13, starting at line 5; Col 15, starting at line 8; Col 16, starting at line 35; session credentials/ cookies/ tokens for persistent/ subsequent sessions).

***Regarding claim 8, Wood et al*** discloses the method wherein the cookies comprise an authentication cookie and a session cookie; and wherein the method comprises authenticating the user's request (Fig 4.410, 420; encrypted login and session credentials/ cookie; Col 9 lines 6-15; Col 14, starting at line 21; claim 23, 24; multiple secured credentials ).

***Regarding claim 9, Wood et al*** discloses the method comprising: defining each of the one or more security domains as a hierarchy of organizations and assets owned by the organizations; and wherein said determining the security domain of the plurality of the security domains to which the operation relates comprises evaluating the user's request in accordance with the hierarchy (Col 15, starting at line 8; domain level credentials).

Furthermore, Martherus et al discloses defining each of the one or more security domains as a hierarchy of organizations and assets owned by the organizations; and wherein said determining the security domain of the plurality of the security domains to which the operation relates comprises evaluating the user's request in accordance with the hierarchy (Col 2, line 1- 67; Col 8, line 40-67; Claims 1-36)

***Regarding claim 20, Wood et al*** discloses the system wherein the identity manager component is adapted to invoke said requested operation with said user identity and role of the session (Fig 1: Gatekeeper; Fig 3A:321, central security architecture).

***Regarding claims 11-13 and 15-18***, they recite the limitations of claims 1-10, therefore, they are rejected applying as above rejecting claims 1-10.

***Regarding claims 21-22 and 24-27***, they recite the limitations of claims 1-10 and 20, therefore, they are rejected applying as above rejecting claims 1-10 and 20.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are further rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Hinton et al (US 6993596 B2)

***Regarding claims 1, 10 and 19***, Hinton et al teaches a method/ medium/ system for managing multiple user identities for a user of an electronic commerce (e-commerce) site, the method/ medium/ system comprising:

defining the e-commerce site as a plurality of security domains ( Col 1, line 62- Col 2, line 67; Col 10, starts at line 36; Claims 1-9; plurality of security server domains); and

in response to a user's request to invoke an operation of the e-commerce site:

determining a security domain of the plurality of security domains to which the operation relates (Col 1, line 62- Col 2, line 67; Col 10, starts at line 36; Claims 1-9 ) ;

selecting a session from a plurality of sessions persisted for the user based on the determined security domain (Col 1, line 62- Col 3, line 35; Col 10, starts at line 36; Claims 1-9; enrolling/ selecting sessions persisted in cross domains) ; and

reusing the session for the user automatically in accordance with the determined security domain (Col 1, line 62- Col 3, line 35; Col 10, starts at line 36; Claims 1-9; vouching the session credentials in security domains), the selected session being associated with a user identity and a role, the user identity and role together indicating privileges for invoking operations of the e-commerce site in at least the determined security domain (Col 1, line 62- Col 3, line 35; Col 10, starts at line 36; Col 16, lines 1-50; Claims 1-9; session being associated with a user identity and a role; vouching the session credentials/ cookies in security domains)

Hinton et al further teaches an identity manager component configured to, in response to a user's request to invoke an operation of the e-commerce site ( Col 4, starts at line 35; Col 7, line 1- Col 9, line 67; Claims 1-20 user identity administrator/ manager)

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment (filed on 09/14/2007) necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the

Art Unit: 2135

date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shanto M Z Abedin whose telephone number is 571-272-3551. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Moazzami Nasser, can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shanto M Z Abedin

Examiner, AU 2136

/KIMYEN VU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135